



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/584,373	05/31/2000	CHRISTOPHER D. BLAIR	105732	1323

7590 02/13/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE PLC
P O BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
BLACKWELL RUDASIL, GWENDOLYN A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1775	//

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/584,373

Applicant(s)

BLAIR ET AL.

Examiner

Gwendolyn A. Blackwell-Rudasill

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-41 and 44 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,11-15,18,24 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,6-10,16,17,19-23,25,42 and 43 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 5 and 11-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. The indicated allowability of claims 13-26 are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference to United States Patent no. 4,057,666, Drummond. Rejections based on the newly cited reference follow.

3. Claims 3-4, 6-10, 16-17, 19-23, 25, and 42-43 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 13-14, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent no. 4,057,666, Drummond.

Drummond discloses a magnetic brush roller that is made of hollow cylinders or sleeves with a coating, (column 3, lines 56-65). The coating can be made of glass, (column 4, lines 48-

Art Unit: 1775

5), wherein the glass coating can be made conductive by the addition of a conductive filler such as metal, meeting the requirement of claims 1, 13-14, and 26 (column 5, lines 5-15).

Although Drummond does not specifically disclose the magnetic brush as a donor roll, the function of the magnetic brush is the same as the donor roll disclosed by applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 2, 5, 11-12, 15, 18, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent no. 4,057,666, Drummond as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of United States Patent no. 5,697,029, Saitoh et al used as evidentiary support.

Art Unit: 1775

Drummond discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 14 above. While Drummond discloses a glass as the coating on the roll, the specific type of glass is not disclosed.

Saitoh et al disclose a developing roller with a sleeve, which has a coating on the sleeve. The core of the roller can be formed of any desired material. The sleeve can be formed from metals or resins, (column 2, lines 33-41). As set out in Comparative Example 2, the coating can be glass, more specifically silicon dioxide, (columns 4-5, lines 66-4). Saitoh et al disclose sputtering a target of quartz glass, which as known in the art will result in a layer of quartz glass, which is a silicate glass.

Because the inventions of Drummond and Saitoh et al are drawn to rollers used in electrostatographic equipment and both disclose having a glass coating on a roller, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the roller of Drummond with the silicate glass layer of Saitoh et al to produce a roller having increased surface mechanical strength as supplied by the glass layer.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

United States Patent no. 3,884,550, Mauerer et al, disclose a waveguide with a core and a glass coating.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gwendolyn A. Blackwell-Rudasill whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1775

(703) 305-9741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday; 6:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (703) 308-3822. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


Gwendolyn A. Blackwell-Rudasill
Examiner
Art Unit 1775

gbr
February 10, 2003


DEBORAH JONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER